REMARKS

In a phone interview on June 1, 2006, the applicant's representative proposed claim amendments and explained why the amended claims are patentable relative to the references cited by the examiner in the action dated April 4, 2006. The examiner agreed that the proposed amendments would distinguish the claims from the references. As the examiner suggested, the applicant is submitting the claim amendments formally in this reply along with a request for continued examination..

All dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as the claims on which they depend. Canceled claims, if any, have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

The absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

No fees are believed due, please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing attorney docket no. 10559-849001.

Applicant : Peter J. Barry et al.   Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-849001 / P16875
Serial No. : 10/665,976
Filed   : September 19, 2003
Page   : 11 of 11

No fees are believed due, please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing attorney docket no. 10559-849001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:_____6/5/6_____

David L. Feigenbaum
Reg. No. 30,378

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906